

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The non-final Office Action mailed on March 18, 2008, has been reviewed and these remarks are responsive thereto. Claims 15 and 16 have been added. Claims 1 and 3-8 have been amended to present the claims in a more preferred form. Applicants submit that the amendments have not changed and are not intended to change the scope of the claimed subject matter. No new matter has been added by the present paper. Claims 1, 3-8 and 10-16 are pending upon entry of the present paper. Reconsideration and allowance of the instant application is respectfully requested.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1, 3, 4, 8, 10 and 11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) as being anticipated WO 02/102035 A2 to Bengtsson et al. ("Bengtsson"). This rejection is traversed.

Independent claim 1 recites, among other features, a "media processing circuitry adapted to provide media processing functionality in the apparatus . . . accessory interface circuitry adapted to transfer a message . . . said message comprising a specification of at least a part of the media processing functionality provided by the media processing circuitry included in the apparatus." The Office Action at pages 2-3 alleges that Bengtsson at Figures 2 and 4, page 5, lines 20-35, page 6, lines 1-34, and page 8, lines 25-34 discloses features similar to those recited above. Applicants respectfully disagree that the cited passages of Bengtsson (or any passages of Bengtsson, for that matter) disclose the above-noted features as recited in claim 1.

Bengtsson at page 6, lines 26-29 discloses that [the external accessory device] "...can send accessory information such as icons, images, sound and text information..." There is thus no reference in Bengtsson to any accessory device capability, or any specification of at least a part of the media processing functionality provided by the accessory device media processing circuitry, in the information sent. Accordingly, claim 1 is allowable over Bengtsson for at least these reasons.

Furthermore, claim 1 recites, "wherein the apparatus is adapted to transfer a message to the mobile communications terminal comprising a command to the mobile communications terminal to disable the specified processing functionality in a second media processing circuitry, the second media processing circuitry located in the mobile telecommunications terminal." The

Office Action at pages 2-3 asserts that Bengtsson at Figures 4 and 6, col. 9, lines 4-7 and col. 11, lines 3-9 discloses features similar to those recited above. Applicants respectfully disagree with such an assertion. In this respect Bengtsson merely discloses that icons are removed from a display of a mobile phone and that status text can be removed from a standby screen of the mobile phone. Thus, the cited passages of Bengtsson do not disclose that specified processing functionality in the media processing circuitry in the mobile telecommunications terminal is disabled. As such, claim 1 is allowable over Bengtsson for at least this additional reason.

In conclusion, there is no reference in Bengtsson to what (if any) media processing functionality the accessory device media processing circuitry may possibly provide. One of skill in the art will appreciate that the above-noted features as recited in claim 1 provide for processing in the apparatus, thus relieving a mobile telecommunications terminal of the burden associated with having to process the related media. Conversely, according to Bengtsson, the mobile telephone only acts as an unintelligent input and output terminal to allow the accessory to interact with the user wherein the mobile terminal executes commands initiated by the accessory. Consequently, claim 1 is novel and patentable over Bengtsson.

Claim 8 recites features similar to those described above with respect to claim 1. As such, claim 8 is allowable for at least substantially similar reasons as those discussed above with respect to claim 1.

Claims 3, 4, 10 and 11 each depend from at least one of claims 1 and 8, and are allowable for at least the same reasons as their respective base claims.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 5 and 12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bengtsson in view of U.S. Patent Publication 2002/0102998 to Lin (“Lin”). This rejection is traversed.

Lin fails to cure the above noted deficiencies of Bengtsson with respect to claims 1 and 8. More specifically, Lin relates to an auxiliary rendering device comprising mobile device communication means for establishing an auxiliary communication session with a mobile device, and rendering means for rendering content received in the auxiliary communication session. See Lin at paragraph [0002]. Further, the mobile device of Lin is characterized by means for

adapting the primary communication session to the capabilities of the auxiliary rendering device. See Lin at paragraph [0008]. That is, according to Lin (and in contrast to the features recited in claims 1 and 8) the communication session is adapted to the capabilities of the auxiliary rendering device. Lin therefore teaches away from the above-noted features of claims 1 and 8 wherein an apparatus/accessory device is utilized to improve the media processing capabilities of the mobile device. Even speculative combinations of Bengtsson with Lin or vice versa are deemed to fail since the discussed features, namely that “said message comprising a specification of at least a part of the media processing functionality provided by the accessory device media processing circuitry” and “wherein the [accessory] device is adapted to transfer a message to the mobile communications terminal comprising a command to the mobile communications terminal to disable the specified processing functionality in the media processing circuitry in the mobile telecommunications terminal” are lacking in Lin and Bengtsson.

Thus, notwithstanding whether a combination of Lin and Bengtsson is proper, the combination fails to result in the features described above with respect to claims 1 and 8.

Claims 5 and 12 each depend from at least one of claims 1 and 8, and are allowable for at least the same reasons as their respective base claims.

Claims 6, 7, 13 and 14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bengtsson et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,751,313 to Zad Issa et al. (“Zad”). This rejection is traversed.

Zad relates to cancellation of an echo signal in a voice communication system. Zad does not even provide an accessory device for a portable communication apparatus. The additional disclosures of Zad are thus not beneficial for the skilled person starting from Bengtsson and aiming at reducing the processing requirements of a mobile terminal in accordance with the above-noted features as recited in claims 1 and 8.

Claims 6, 7, 13, and 14 each depend from at least one of claims 1 and 8. The dependent claims are allowable for at least the same reasons as their respective base claims (notwithstanding whether the proposed combination of references is proper).

CONCLUSION

For at least the reasons set forth above, Applicants submit that the pending claims distinguish over the applied art, and are in condition for allowance. However, if the Examiner believes that further discussion and/or amendment would be helpful, the Examiner is invited to telephone Applicants' undersigned representative.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: July 28, 2008

By: _____ /Ross Dannenberg/
Ross A. Dannenberg
Registration No. 49,024
Banner & Witcoff, Ltd.
1100 13th St. N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005-4051
Tel: (202) 824-3000
Fax: (202) 824-3001